Linda A. King State Bar # 087138
Law Offices of Linda A. King
2044 First Ave., Suite 200
San Diego, Ca 92101-2079
619) 233-8034 FAX (619) 233-4516

Attorney for Nuria Christina Ramirez

United States District Court

Southern District of California

United States of America, Plaintiff, vs. CARLOS SAAVEDRA, Defendant	Case No.: 08MJ8065 – 08CR302 **POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MATERIAL WITNESS MOTION FOR VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION AND REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF REASONS IN SUPPORT OF CUSTODY** **DATE: February 22, 2008** **TIME: 10:00 am** **HON.: Magistrate Judge Peter Lewis**

Material Witness, Nuria Christina Ramirez (hereafter “Material Witness”) by and through her counsel, Linda A. King, submit the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of her motion to take her videotape deposition.

////

////

////

I

INTRODUCTION

On or about, January 23, 2008, the Material Witness was detained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in connection with the arrest of Carlos Saavedra, the defendant in the above-entitled case. The defendant has been charged with illegally bringing in undocumented aliens in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324 and the Material Witness has been detained as a Material Witness under 8 U.S.C. § 1227 (d).

The Material Witness is being held in custody. She wishes to post a bond but immigration has placed a hold on her and will not allow her to be released on bond.

It is unnecessary to keep the Material Witness in the United States because her testimony can be preserved through the use of videotape depositions. The Material Witness therefore requests a court order that her testimony be preserved through the use of videotape deposition and, thereafter, that she be allowed to return to her family in El Salvador.

II

THE TESTIMONY OF THE MATERIAL WITNESS CAN BE SECURED BY VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION AND THERE IS NO COMPELLING REASON TO KEEP HIM IN CUSTODY

Title 18, section 3144 of the United States Code Provides:

> No Material Witness may be detained . . . if the testimony of such witness can adequately be secured by deposition, and if further detention is not necessary to prevent a failure of justice.

---

[1] While a witness may be detained for a reasonable period of time, the court must vigilantly guard an undocumented alien's "overriding liberty interest" and schedule a videotape deposition at the earliest possible time. See, Aguilar-Ayala v. Ruiz 973 F. 2d 411, 419 (5th Cir. 1992).

Deposition of the Material Witnesses may be used at trial in criminal cases, so it is only in *exceptional circumstances,* where the interests of justice will be denied, that a videotape deposition is not appropriate. See, **Torres-Ruiz v. United States** 120 F.3d 933 (9th Cir. 1997) [citing **Aguilar Ayala v. Ruiz** 973 F.2d 411, 413 (5th Cir. 1992) **see also** 8 U.S.C. § 1324 (d), Federal Rules of Evidence 804, and Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 15. Defendant may be present at the videotape deposition and therefore have a full and fair opportunity to cross-examine the witness. The videotape provides sufficient indicia of reliability to afford the trier of fact a satisfactory basis for evaluation the truth of a statement. **Dutton v. Evans** 400 U.S. 74, 89 (1970).

The government or defendant can effectuate the detention of the material witness upon a showing that (1) the material witness will, in all likelihood, be unavailable to testify for trial, and (2) that the use of deposition testimony will deny the defendant a fair trial and that live testimony would somehow be significantly different. **See**, **Aguilar-Ayala v. Ruiz** 973 F.2d at 413 (5th Cir. 1992), **United States v. Humberto Rivera** 859 F.2d

1204, 1208 (4th Cir. 1988). That would be a difficult burden in this case, however, because the Material Witnesses has indicated they are willing to return for trial if the government makes arrangements for their legal re-entry into the country and provides travel expenses. [2] (King Decl. At para. 6).

---

[2] The government would undoubtedly take reasonable steps in this case, as it has in other similar cases, to secure the witness's testimony at trial by personally subpoenaing the witness, providing travel costs, and arranging for legal re-entry of the alien. (See, **United States v. Eufracio-Torris** 890 F.2d 266, 270 (10th Cir. 1989) cert. Denied 494 U.S. 1008 (1990) [government need not guarantee the witness will be available, only that they use food-faith efforts to secure their presence at trial]; **see also, Ohio v. Roberts** 448 U.S. 56, 65 (1980) [so long as the government uses reasonable measures to secure a witness at trial, a deposition is admissible over a defendant's Confrontation Classy and hearsay objections].

The Material Witness should not be detained because her testimony can be adequately secured by deposition. Based on interviews with the Material Witness and the report submitted by the arresting agency, the facts to which the Material Witness is competent to testify is straightforward. (King Decl. At para. 5).

Moreover, neither the Material Witness nor their counsel has been informed that the witness' detention is necessary to prevent a failure of justice. (King Decl. At para. 4). Quite to the contrary, the witness has already spent a considerable time in jail and it is very important that he be released as soon as possible so that he may be reunited with his family in Mexico. (King Decl. At para. 3.)

For these reasons, the Material Witness requests that the court immediately orders the taking of his videotape deposition and that he thereafter is immediately returned to El Salvador.

III

IF THE COURT DENIES THE MATERIAL WITNESS REQUEST TO TAKE HER VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION, SHE MAY REQUEST THAT THE GOVERNMENT PROVIDE HER WITH A STATEMENT OF REASONS WHY SHE HAS TO REMAIN IN CUSTODY

Where a witness has been held in custody for more than 10 days, the government has an obligation to prepare a biweekly report stating the reasons why such witness should not be released with or without the taking of a deposition. Fed Rules Crim. Proc., Rule 46 (g).

The Material Witness is not aware of the any reasons why she should remain in custody, but to the extent the government knows of any such reason, he hereby requests that the government provide him with a copy of a biweekly written report indicating these reasons.

////

////

////

IV

CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, the Material Witness respectfully requests that the motion for the taking of a videotaped deposition be granted. In the alternative, the Witness requests that she immediately be provided with a statement of reasons why she needs to remain in custody.

Dated this February 7, 2008

_s/ Linda A. King__
Linda A. King
Attorney for Material Witness